

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

a copy is attached hereto. No new matter has been added. Copies of these new formal drawings have also been sent to the official draftsman under separate cover.

Claims Rejections

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 1-138

Claims 1-138 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated February 13, 2003, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of only the single reference of Raven et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,429,361). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 1, 16, 41-43, 68, 69, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, and 135-138 are independent claims. The remainder of the claims are dependent claims, and as such depend from their respective independent claims.

The Examiner states:

Raven et al. discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines. The system has display and data entry means for a player or employee to interact with the system. Furthermore, in addition to gaming functions, the system downloads data from the central data processor to each individual gaming machine.

Paper 7, Pg. 2, Sec. 3.

I. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138

Specifically, regarding claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of "integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information."

However, the Examiner states:

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system were well known. It would have been obvious to integrate the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information.
Paper 7, Pp. 3-4.

Applicants note that the Examiner has included all of the independent claims in the above grouping except for independent claims 42 and 69, which also contain the "integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information" claim element. Applicants further note that independent claims 42 and 69 have not been referred to anywhere else in the Office Action. Thus, Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to include all of the independent claims, including claims 42 and 69, in this specific rejection.

For brevity, only the basis for the rejection of independent claims 1, 16, 41-43, 68, 69, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, and 135-138 is traversed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims listed above. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of independent claims 1, 16, 41-43, 68, 69, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, and 135-138, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner's assertion that integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action, yet has not asserted that any of them support his position that integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner's assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest "integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information," and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68, 69, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138 has been overcome. Since this includes all of the independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 has been overcome.

II. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 6, 38, 65, and 98

Specifically, regarding claims 6, 38, 65, and 98, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of "a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor." Claims 6, 38, 65, and 98, are dependent claims, and as such, are patentably distinct over the prior art due to the patentability of their respective independent claims, which are discussed above in Section I. Nevertheless, dependent claims 6, 38, 65, and 98 also include additional features that, in combination with those of their respective independent claims provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner's assertion, that the use of "a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor," in combination with "integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system" is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action, yet has not asserted that any of them support his opinion that the combination of these elements is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner's assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest the use of "a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor," and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 6, 38, 65, and 98 has been overcome. Moreover, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 have been overcome for the reasons set forth in Section I.

III. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 7, 39, 66, 75 and 99

Specifically, regarding claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of "calibration software that enables the additional processor to calibrate the display of system information on the display screen." Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99 are dependent

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

claims, and as such, are patentably distinct over the prior art due to the patentability of their respective independent claims, which are discussed above in Section I. Nevertheless, dependent claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99 also include additional features that, in combination with those of their respective independent claims provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner's assertion, that the use of "calibration software that enables the additional processor to calibrate the display of system information on the display screen," in combination with "integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system" is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action, yet has not asserted that any of them support his opinion that the combination of these elements is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner's assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest the use of "calibration software that enables the additional processor to calibrate the display of system information on the display screen," and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99 has been overcome. Moreover, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 have been overcome for the reasons set forth in Section I.

IV. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, and 116

Specifically, regarding claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, and 116, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of “the systems interface utilizes touch screen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network.” Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, and 116 are dependent claims, and as such are patentably distinct over the prior art due to the patentability of their respective independent claims, which are discussed above in Section I. Nevertheless, dependent claims 78, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116 also include additional features that, in combination with those of their respective independent claims provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner’s assertion that the use of “the systems interface utilizes touch screen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network,” in combination with “integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system” is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action, yet has not asserted that any of them support his opinion that the combination of these elements is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner’s assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest the use of “the systems interface utilizes touch screen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network,” and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106 and 116 has been overcome. Moreover, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 have been overcome for the reasons set forth in Section I.

V. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claim 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, and 125

Specifically, regarding claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, and 125, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of “the gaming display screen includes a small region that, when selected, activates the system interface.” Claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, and 125 are dependent claims, and as such are patentably distinct over the prior art due to the patentability of their respective independent claims, which are discussed above in Section I. Nevertheless, dependent claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, and 125 also include additional features that, in combination with those of their respective independent claims provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner’s assertion that the use of “the gaming display screen includes a small region that, when selected, activates the system interface,” in combination with “integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system” is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action, yet has not asserted that any of them support his opinion that the combination of these elements is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner's assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest the use of "the gaming display screen includes a small region that, when selected, activates the system interface," and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, and 125 has been overcome. Moreover, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 have been overcome for the reasons set forth in Section I.

VI. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claim 33, 60, 93, and 131

Specifically, regarding claims 33, 60, 93, and 131, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of "the display process that runs the gaming interface supports a graphic user interface based wagering system." Claims 33, 60, 93, and 131 are dependent claims, and as such, are patentably distinct over the prior art due to the patentability of their respective independent claims, which are discussed above in Section I. Nevertheless, dependent claims 33, 60, 93, 131 also include additional features that, in combination with those of their respective independent claims provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner's assertion that the use of "the display process that runs the gaming interface supports a graphic user interface based wagering system," in combination with

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

“integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system” is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action, yet has not asserted that any of them support his opinion that the combination of these elements is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner’s assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest the use of “the display process that runs the gaming interface supports a graphic user interface based wagering system,” and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 33, 60, 93, and 131 has been overcome. Moreover, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 have been overcome for the reasons set forth in Section I.

VII. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 36, 63, and 96

Specifically, regarding claims 36, 63, and 96, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of “the converter card utilizes I²C hardware and signaling.” Claims 36, 63, and 96 are dependent claims, and as such, are patentably distinct over the prior art due to the patentability of their respective independent claims, which are discussed above in Section I. Nevertheless, dependent claims 36, 63, and 96 also include additional features that, in

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

combination with those of their respective independent claims provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner's assertion that the use of "the converter card utilizes I²C hardware and signaling," in combination with "integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system" is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action and yet has not asserted that any of them support his opinion that the combination of these elements is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner's assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest the use of "the converter card utilizes I²C hardware and signaling," and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 36, 63, and 96 has been overcome. Moreover, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 have been overcome for the reasons set forth in Section I.

VIII. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 40, 67, and 134

Specifically, regarding claims 40, 67, and 134, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of "integrating the systems interface via the display screen lowers overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduces maintenance costs due to fewer hardware

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

parts.” Claims 40, 67, and 134 are dependent claims, and as such, are patentably distinct over the prior art due to the patentability of their respective independent claims, which are discussed above in Section I. Nevertheless, dependent claims 40, 67, and 134 also include additional features that, in combination with those of their respective independent claims provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Respectfully, the Examiner’s assertion, that the use of “integrating the systems interface via the display screen lowers overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduces maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts,” in combination with “integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system” is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than ten different references in the current Office Action, and yet has not asserted that any of them support his opinion that the combination of these elements is well known. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art without any supporting references, after the Applicants have challenged the Examiner’s assertion as to what is well known in the art. MPEP. 2144.03.

Accordingly, since the Raven et al. reference does not teach or suggest the use of “integrating the systems interface via the display screen lowers overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduces maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts,” and there is nothing in the art of record to support the assertion that this is well known, Applicants respectfully submit that the

Atty Docket No.: 10407/519
Serial No. 09/967,221

35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 40, 67, and 134 has been overcome. Moreover, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all of claims 1-138 have been overcome for the reasons set forth in Section I.

CLOSURE

Applicants have made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-138 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8319. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 5:30 PM Pacific time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

4/30/03

Brooke W. Quist

BROOKE W. QUIST
Reg. No. 45,030
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER
& STEINER LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 711
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 712-8300

RLK:elm